

This document is classified as **White** in accordance with the Panel Information Policy. Information can be shared with the public, and any members may publish the information, subject to copyright.

TABASC Effectiveness Review Questionnaire on Live Operations

- **Context and Purpose**

Context and Purpose

Who?

The [Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee](#) (TABASC) is engaging with SEC Parties and DCC Users, with a focus on operational DCC Users or those undergoing the [User Entry Process](#) (UEP).

Why?

On direction from the SEC Panel and in accordance with [SEC Section F1.4](#) the TABASC is required to review the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture, Business Architecture and the Home Area Network (HAN) requirements. The questionnaire findings will help inform whether further investigation is required.

What?

This confidential questionnaire has been issued to SEC Parties.

The findings will be shared with the SEC Panel and its Sub-committees only to inform whether further work is required in relation to the effectiveness of the Technical Architecture, Business Architecture, HAN requirements and any operational issues affecting the User experience with the End-to-End processes including those managed and provided by the DCC.

One questionnaire response is requested per organisation. Each organisation response should include feedback from the technical and operational aspects of each organisation.

Where an issue results from a known defect then there is no need to describe that in detail.

When?

The questionnaire is open for responses for one month from it being issued. It is the intention to repeat the questionnaire at four-to-six-month intervals.

Where?

This questionnaire has been made available in MS Word and PDF format. It can also be printed for use internally before providing a single response online.

- **Confidentiality**

It is recognised that any information you provide may have commercial sensitivity and will be treated in confidence for analysis, and any resulting recommendations reported to the SEC Panel.

The questionnaire is being undertaken by SECAS on behalf of the TABASC. All information will be treated in confidence.

However, if a DCC User identifies an emerging problem, it might be necessary for the TABASC to obtain further details for clarification. For this reason, the Questionnaire asks for the name of your Organisation and Contact details (for any necessary follow-up).

1. Organisation details

Please provide the name of your organisation and contact details (for any necessary follow-up)

Name:	
Company:	
Email Address:	
Phone Number:	

Number of Commissioned Devices.

Number of Commissioned Devices.				
0	1 - 50	51-500	501-5000	>5000
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What percentage of your installed Smart Metering systems include pre-payment Devices?				
0%	1 – 10%	11-25%	26-50%	>50%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. Section 1: DCC Systems, services and processes

<p>How satisfied are you with the systems, services and processes (including those associated with the Communications Hub) provided by the DCC for your business operations?</p> <p>1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.</p>	
---	--

Have your business operations been adversely affected by the performance of the DCC Systems, services or processes? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High. Leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

Did the adverse effects arise from:	Impact
Poor network connectivity to the DCC using the Gamma link	
Poor application connectivity using the DCC User Interface Specification (DUIS)	
Overall system response times	

Did the adverse effects arise from:	Impact
Connectivity with Communications Hubs in the Communication Service Provider (CSP) North Region	
Connectivity with Communications Hubs in the CSP Central and South Regions	
Incidents and problems relating to the technical architecture	
DCC business services or processes	
A lack of technical functionality available now	
A lack of functionality in the overall system	
Any other situations, please expand below in the box below.	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

Have you experienced	Impact
Data quality issues when using the DCC services or processes? e.g., discrepancies between data held by your organisation compared to that held within/by the DCC	
Disruptions to services as a consequence of data quality issues?	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

Have you identified any other areas of DCC systems, services and processes that require improvement? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

3. Section 2: Home Area Network (HAN) and Device performance

How satisfied are you with the performance of the HAN and associated Devices? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	
--	--

Have your business operations been adversely affected by HAN or Device performance? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High. Leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

Did the performance issues arise from:	Impact
Responsiveness of Devices on the HAN	
The range of 2.4GHz connectivity (does coverage meet expectations?)	
The range of 868MHz (Dual Band) connectivity (does coverage meet expectations?)	
Problems with integrating In Home Displays or Pre-Payment Interface Devices	
Problems with interoperability between Devices on the HAN, e.g., different versions of specifications or where more than one Supplier is involved	
Problems with interchangeability, e.g., when inheriting equipment on churn	
Any other causes – please expand	

Have the HAN or Device problems had an apparent link to installations	Impact
In the North CSP region	
In the Central CSP region	
In the Southern CSP region	
Involving MESH	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

If you have identified any areas for improvement in the HAN and Device performance, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

4. Section 3: Firmware Upgrades

Do you have experience of Firmware Upgrades via the DCC? If so, please answer the questions in this section.

What percentage of firmware updates are completed successfully?				
<40%%	40-60%	60-80%	80-90%	>90%
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

In the questions below, please provide an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High. Leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

Did firmware upgrade problems arise from:	Impact
Firmware Upgrades to the ESME	
Firmware Upgrades to the GSME	
Firmware Upgrades to the Communications Hub in the North Region	
Firmware Upgrades to the Communications Hub in the Central and South Regions	
The process used by the vendor to provide ESME or GSME Firmware to the Supplier	
The process used by the Supplier to provide ESME or GSME Firmware to the DCC	
The listing of the Firmware version in the Central Product List (CPL)	
The distribution of the Firmware upgrade by the DCC (e.g., within expected timescales)	
Activation of the Firmware upgrade (e.g., did it happen as expected)	
The quality and effectiveness of Firmware in live operation (e.g., errors encountered)	
Any other causes	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

Have you identified any areas relating to firmware management for improvement? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

5. Section 4: System performance

How satisfied are you with the system performance to date? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	
---	--

Have installation rates been adversely affected by overall system performance? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High. Leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

Did the problem arise from	Impact
DCC Commissioning systems and processes not working effectively (e.g., preventing the meter being commissioned by the Supplier)	
User Installation systems and processes challenges (e.g., use of HHT to install)	
User Commissioning systems and process challenges (e.g., allowing Devices to be Commissioned and SMKI Certificates changed)	
Service Requests not being processed quickly enough (end to end)	
Not receiving the information you need from the system quickly enough	
Incorrect or missing alerts	
Any other causes – please expand in the box below.	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

What proportion of installations that have been aborted are due to the above issues?

0%	1% – 25%	26%-50%	51%-75%	>75%	No installs undertaken
<input type="checkbox"/>					

Please specify any supporting details below indicating whether it is being progressed.

Have you identified any areas relating to System Performance for improvement? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

6. Section 5: Business processes

How satisfied are you with the current business processes? 1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.	
---	--

Have your business operations been adversely affected by the Smart Metering business processes? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High. Leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

Did the problem arise from	Impact
Installations being delayed due to a technical issue(s) in the DCC Systems affecting business processes	
Installations being delayed due to a technical issue(s) in User Systems affecting business processes	
Business as Usual (BAU) operational processes taking longer or needing more resources due to technical issues	
Specific business processes not performing as planned (e.g., Change of Supplier)	
Submission of Threshold Anomaly Detection values	
The release of quarantined messages	

Did the problem arise from	Impact
The processes affecting the consumer experience (e.g., requiring consumer contact or manual processing to complete readings, billings and changes of circumstances)	
Service Requests not supporting the User obligations	
The Technical Architecture not being capable of supporting smart home services	
Any other causes	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

Have you identified any areas related to business processes for improvement? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

7. Section 6: Issues related to SMKI, DCCKI, and / or IKI

<p>How satisfied are you with the operation of Smart Metering Key Infrastructure (SMKI), DCC Key Infrastructure (DCCKI) and Infrastructure Key Infrastructure (IKI) to date?</p> <p>1 = Very Dissatisfied; 10 = Very Satisfied.</p>	
---	--

Have your business operations been adversely affected by any key infrastructure issues? If so, please answer the questions in this section, where an impact score of 1 = Low, 2 = Medium and 3 = High. Leave blank if the issue did not affect your organisation.

Did the problem arise from	Impact
The use of SMKI Keys, Certificates or process involving Senior Responsible Officers (SRO) and Authorised Responsible Officers (ARO)	
The use of DCCKI processes for DCC connectivity	
The use of IKI processes for file-signing (e.g., Threshold Anomaly Detection)	
Any other causes	

Please describe the nature and extent of the problem(s).

Have you identified any areas related to SMKI, DCCKI, and / or IKI for improvement? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.

8. Section 7: Any other issues

Do you have any other issues that you would like to bring to the attention of the Technical Architecture and Business Architecture Sub-Committee (TABASC)? If so, please specify below and indicate how it is being progressed.